



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: 1500 POKER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/903,520	07/11/2001	Avi Ashkenazi	10466/83	1093
35489	7590	02/19/2009		
GOODWIN PROCTER LLP			EXAMINER	
135 COMMONWEALTH DRIVE			BASI, NIRMAL SINGH	
MENLO PARK, CA 94025				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1646	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/19/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/903,520	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ASHKENAZI ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> NIRMAL S. BASI	<b>Art Unit</b> 1646

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/1/08.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 44-47 and 49-51 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 44-47 and 49-51 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
     1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
     2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
     3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_ .  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Amendment filed 12/10/08 has been entered. Arguments filed 8/18/08 have been entered. Claims 44-47 and 49-51 are pending in this application and are examined below.
2. Applicants' arguments, pertaining to the rejection of the claims under, 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as lacking enablement, have been fully considered but they have not been found to be persuasive. Applicants' arguments are discussed in the rejection below.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 44-47 and 49-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as lacking enablement for reasons of record and those given below. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Applicants argue PRO335 polypeptides are useful in the treatment of conditions such as viral infections and cancer and one skilled in the art would know how to use these polypeptides without undue experimentation. It is argued that the MLR assay suffices to provide enablement. Applicants have previously argued compounds which stimulate the proliferation of stimulated T-lymphocytes are useful therapeutically where the enhancement of an immune response would be beneficial. However, the ability of the claimed PRO335 protein to stimulate or inhibit lymphocyte proliferation in the MLR assay does not provide for what specific conditions or for which specific diseases the

claimed invention would predictably function for a therapeutic suppression of the immune system. The assertion that the claimed invention could be useful for the treatment of conditions where the enhancement of the immune response would be beneficial is not enabled by the disclosure of the instant specification. The only use contemplated for the claimed invention is a therapeutic suppression of the immune system. Kahan clearly states that no *in vitro* immune assay predicts or correlates with *in vivo* immunosuppressive efficacy; there is no surrogate immune parameter as a basis of immunosuppressive efficacy and/or for dose extrapolation from *in vitro* systems to *in vivo* conditions (Cur. Opin. Immunol. 4: 553-560, 1992; see entire document, particularly page 558, column 2). Piccotti et al. (Transplantation 67: 1453-1460, 1999) demonstrate that IL-12 enhances alloantigen-specific immune function as determined by MLC, but this result *in vitro* does not result in a measurable response *in vivo* (i.e. failure to accelerate allograft rejection) (see page 1459). Campo et al. (Biological Trace Element Res. 79: 15-22, 2001) demonstrate that while zinc suppresses alloreactivity in MLC, it does not decrease T-cell proliferation *in vitro* nor produce immunosuppressive effects *in vivo*. Therefore, while the art recognizes the MLR assay as accepted for initial screening for immunosuppressive or immunostimulative molecules *in vitro*, which is not art recognized for being generally predictive of their *in vivo* effectiveness, this biological activity does not correlate to use of the claimed protein in a therapeutically effective manner, as the asserted use of the claimed invention proposes.

The enablement of claimed invention is based on Assay 74 disclosed in the specification. Assay 74 states, "Positive increases over control are considered positive with increases of greater than or equal to 180% being preferred. However, any value greater than control indicates a stimulatory effect for the test protein." Applicants further look for support in the declaration of Sherman Fong. Dr. Fong generally discusses that the MLR assay is widely used and discloses IL-22 as a known immune stimulant, which has been shown to stimulate T-cell proliferation in the MLR assay. Dr. Fong further goes on to state on page 3, paragraph 10, "It is my considered scientific opinion that a PRO polypeptide shown to stimulate T-cell proliferation in the MLR assay of the present invention with at least 180% of the control, as specified in the present

Art Unit: 1646

application, is expected to have the type of activity as that exhibited by II-2". The examiner agrees with the statement that that a PRO polypeptide shown to stimulate T-cell proliferation in the MLR assay of the present invention with at least 180% of the control, as specified in the present application, could possibly have the type of activity as that exhibited by II-2. The problem is that PRO335 has not been disclosed to have T-cell proliferation activity in the MLR assay with at least 180% of the control. The exact value is not disclosed. The number of samples tested is not disclosed. The statistical analysis applied to analyze the results is not disclosed. The disclosure only states that the results were positive. A result of 100.1% is positive; just as a result of 180% is positive. Lets turn to assay 79, which is similar to assay 74, but where any decrease is considered to be a positive result for an inhibitory compound, with decreases of less than or equal to 80% being preferred. Based on the prior art and even Applicants preferences, values around the control are less preferable, because clear statements such as those by Dr. Fong that the MLR assay of the present invention with at least 180% of the control could possibly have the type of activity as that exhibited by II-2 could not be made otherwise. Could this statement be made if the activity was 100.1%, for example? The specification does not provide any values or data for the proteins tested in the assay. The specification does not provide any statistics for the values measured in the assay. The specification provides no information at all regarding the results of the assay except that certain proteins tested positive and the statement that "any value greater than control indicates a stimulatory effect for the test protein". The magnitude of the value over control is important, even Dr. Fong highlights the value of 180%.

The questions are: What specific disease states would benefit by therapeutic enhancement of stimulation of lymphocyte proliferation by use of the claimed antibody or PRO335? What do the results of the MLR assay of Example 74, using PRO335, disclose about the disease state that could be treated by stimulation of lymphocyte proliferation? As disclosed by the examples provided by applicant different compounds effect the stimulation of lymphocyte proliferation to different degrees and in turn have different therapeutic effects. II-2 arguments natural killer cell activity in patients with

AIDS and is recommended for advanced renal cell carcinoma. II-15 which was found to be at least as potent and effective as IL-2 in the MLR assay prolongs survival of lymphoma-bearing mice and suppresses pulmonary metastases induced by injection of sarcoma. II-21 found to enhance the proliferation of T cells in an MLR assay potentially inhibits B16 melanoma tumors. Alpha-GalCer demonstrated to enhance the T-cell response in an MLR assay inhibits tumor metastasis in liver or lung. Therefore, based on the varied effects of the compounds that have stimulated the lymphocyte proliferation assay no prediction as to the specific therapeutic value of PRO335 cannot be made without further experimentation. The compounds that tested positive in the MLR assays discussed above did not produce the same amount of stimulation in the assays and did not result as therapeutics for the same disease states.

The MLR assay is an accepted a preliminary *in vitro* model for screening immunosuppressive or immunostimulant agents. However, the assay must be evaluated as it pertains to the asserted use of the claimed invention, which is for therapeutic enhancement of the immune response of an individual. If the claimed invention is to be used for therapeutic enhancement of the immune response of an individual, the question to ask is how are the results of the MLR assay related to the asserted use of the claimed invention? Fung-Leung et al. cited by Applicants (see IDS 10/30/06) for support that the MLR assay is used for identifying immunomodulatory compounds. However, the disclosure of Fung-Leung et al. is much more than what is in the instant specification and the immunosuppressive effect being measured was specifically for alloantigens. Several controls were run, as were determinations that the inhibitory effect was not related to cell toxicity. Lastly, Fung-Leung et al. concluded that the results of the multiple MLR assays and controls "suggests its potential use as an immunosuppressant in clinical therapy" (page 364, first sentence). It was not until the compound was tested in an *in vivo* mouse model that the authors declared it an immunosuppressant. Therefore, the conclusions reached by Fung-Leung et al. are based on much more experimental data, assays and testing that that provided in the instant specification and the reference does not support the position that the MLR assay in the instant specification is predictive of use as a therapeutic compound for

suppressing the immune response. The results of the MLR assay in the instant specification are merely preliminary, and much more experimentation is necessary for one of ordinary skill in the art to use the claimed invention in the manner disclosed. This experimentation would be considered undue, because until it is performed, the skilled artisan cannot use the claimed invention in the manner disclosed.

Further, there is no guidance in the specification as to how PRO335 could be used to boost the response to any antigen. Current Protocols in Immunology states on p. 3.12.11 that the MLR "only detects dividing cells instead of measuring true effector T-cell function" and that it is "not clear which T cell function is measured in proliferate assays", and further that "the proliferate response should be used solely as a general indicators of T cell reactivity". Data obtained might variously reflect proliferation of CTL, lymphokine producing T cells, or non-activated bystander cells and will be severely affected by the function of non-T cells. Differences in responsiveness in a proliferative assay in part reflect differences in IL-2 production, according to Current Protocols in Immunology. As has been stated previously, the MLR measures the reactivity of one individual to another and is, as Current Protocols in Immunology states, **highly variable**. Current Protocols in Immunology in fact describes many variables that must be controlled for. In the instant application, no such controls, such as for maximum response or for the inherent variability of individual responses, are provided. There is no indication of the statistical significance of the results. There are no autologous controls. No correlation is provided to any particular *in vivo* function; there is no guidance to indicate that PRO335 could be used to any therapeutic effect for the treatment of diseases such as cancer or HIV. The references cited by Applicant fail to provide compensatory guidance. Steinman and Thurner et al. (cited by applicants on 8/20/04) address the utility of dendritic cells but not of a stimulatory MLR. Gubler (cited by applicants on 8/20/04) describes the identification of the molecule IL-12 but uses the MLR merely to compare activities, not as the basis for describing a molecule as a therapeutically useful immunostimulant. The subsequent research of Peterson et al. (cited by applicants on 8/20/04) was clearly required to suggest that the molecule could be used in this fashion. Thus, without further guidance correlating the observed

stimulatory activity to a particular, useful property, it would require undue experimentation to use PRO335 .

Returning to the Declaration of Dr. Sherman Fong. In assessing the weight to be given expert testimony, the Examiner may properly consider, among other things, the nature of the fact sought to be established, the strength of any opposing evidence, and the interest of the expert in the outcome of the case, and the presence or absence of factual support for the expert's opinion. See Ex parte Simpson, 61 USPQ2d 1009 (BPAI 2001), Cf. Redac Int'l. Ltd. v. Lotus Development Corp., 81 F.3d 1576, 38 USPQ2d 1665 (Fed. Cir. 1996), Paragon Podiatry Lab., Inc. v. KLM Lab., Inc., 948 F.2d 1182, 25 USPQ2d 1561, (Fed. Cir. 1993). In the instant situation, the nature of the fact sought to be established is whether or not the disclosure that PRO335 tested "positive" in the MLR assay of Example 74 supports the assertion that it could be used to stimulate proliferation of T-lymphocytes. Dr. Fong's statement that the present invention has an activity of at least 180% is questioned because there is no data presented to support this conclusion. The specification may state that increases of greater than or equal to 180% are preferred, but there is no disclosure, in the specification or in any other source, that the alleged increase reported in the specification for the claimed protein was of any particular degree. The only conclusion that can be made from the evidence provided for the claimed protein of PRO 335 is that the increase was a value greater than control since this was the standard provided for determination of a positive increase. Without the knowledge of the exact magnitude of the increase over control the significance of the result can be evaluated so as to provide enablement of the claimed invention in any specific *in vivo* therapeutic use. The expert has interest in the outcome of the case since Dr. Fong is listed as an inventor and is employed by the assignee. Finally, the expert refers to Gubler et al. as factual support for the conclusions in the declaration. Guber discloses the effect of IL-12 which was determined by more research following the MLR assay. However, Gubler does not appear to indicate that all proteins shown to be positive in an MLR assay would be expected to have the same effects on the same disease states as those shown by IL-12. Further, Gubler et al. (as well as Peterson et al. and Thurner et al.) are silent to any activity possessed by the PRO 335

as it pertains to its *in vivo* use. The Fong declaration evinces that the instant specification provides a mere invitation to experiment, and not how to use the invention. Also, it is noted that no agonistic or antagonistic effect of molecules on PRO335, as it relates to its effect on a specific disease state, are disclosed in the specification. Also, no molecules that specially bind to PRO335 were evaluated in the MLR assay. Because the claimed invention is not enabled and does not meet the requirements of 112/1<sup>st</sup> paragraph for the reasons provided above and the previous office actions.

4. Claims 44, 47, 50 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 1 12, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant ad that the inventors), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claims are drawn to polypeptide comprising the extracellular domain of the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:290. The extracellular domain of the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:290 is not disclosed in the specification nor in the prior art. Although, the complete structure of PRO355 can be envisioned, no prediction, based on the structure of PRO355, can be made as to which amino acid sequences comprise the extracellular domain. The specification discloses a signal sequence (amino acids 1-19) and a transmembrane domain (amino acids 746-765). The extracellular domain is not disclosed. The structure of the extracellular domain can not be deduced based on the signal peptide and the transmembrane domain. Based on the signal peptide and the transmembrane domain it can not be predicted which fragments of the polypeptide are intracellular and which are extracellular. Further, the specification discloses one transmembrane domain but does not state that the polypeptide has only one transmembrane domain. The polypeptide may contain more than one intracellular and extracellular domains. Thus, the claims are drawn to genus of polypeptides that is defined only by an undisclosed structural domain which could possibly be present in unrelated polypeptides.

To provide evidence of possession of a claimed genus, the specification must provide sufficient distinguishing identifying characteristics of the genus. The factors to be considered include disclosure of compete or partial structure, physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics, structure/function correlation, methods of making the claimed product, or any combination thereof. In this case, the only factor present in the claim the recitation of an undefined "extracellular domain". Accordingly, in the absence of sufficient recitation of distinguishing identifying characteristics, the specification does not provide adequate written description of the claimed genus. Naming a type of material generically known to exist, in the absence of knowledge as to what that material consists of, is not a description of that material. When one is unable to envision the detailed constitution of a complex chemical compound having a particular function, such as a polypeptide, so as to distinguish it from other materials, as well as a method for obtaining it, conception has not been achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, i.e., until after the polypeptide has been isolated. Thus, claiming all polypeptides that achieve a result without defining what means will do so is not in compliance with the description requirement. Rather, it is an attempt to preempt the future before it has arrived. The claims are not even directed to polypeptides, which have a specific function associated with PRO335, they are directed to a general function associated with all proteins. Further, if applicant argues PRO335 works in the MLR assay by immunostimulation, it must be noted that the immunostimulation activity is not considered an activity that that has been correlated with a specific structure contained in PRO335 as it pertains to said assay. Further non-functional or functionally unrelated proteins to PRO335 are encompassed by the claims. The recited structural relationships are arbitrary since neither the specification nor the prior art discloses any definitive relationship between the claimed "extracellular domain" and protein function.

While one of skill in the art can readily envision numerable species of polypeptide sequences that are at least a given % identity to a reference polypeptide, one cannot envision which of these polypeptides would comprise the "extracellular domain" of the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:290.

*Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 19USPQ2d 1111 , clearly states that applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the "written description" inquiry, whatever is now claimed." (See page 1117.) The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the ad to recognize that (he or she) invented what is claimed." (See *Vas-Cath* at page 1116). As discussed above, the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed genus of polypeptides, and therefore conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method of isolating it. The compound itself is required. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC1993) and *Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016.

One cannot describe what one has not conceived. See *Fiddes v. Baird*, 30 USPQ2d 1481 at 1483. In *Fiddes*, claims directed to mammalian FGF'S were found to be unpatentable due to lack of written description for that broad class. The specification provided only the bovine sequence.

Therefore, only isolated polypeptides comprising the amino acid sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO: 290 but not the full breadth of the claims meets the written description provision of 35 U.S.C.112, first paragraph. Applicant is reminded that *Vas-Cath* makes clear that the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. 112 is severable from its enablement provision (see page 1 115).

5. No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NIRMAL S. BASI whose telephone number is (571)272-0868. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Nickol can be reached on 571-272-0835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nirmal S. Basi/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1646

/Michael Pak/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1646